

Prineville District  
Lower Burnt Ranch Vault Toilet, EA# OR-054-03-101  
**Finding of No Significant Impact**  
Determination

**Introduction:**

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis (EA) No. **OR-054-03-101**, for a proposed action to install a vault toilet at Lower Burnt Ranch Recreation Site, otherwise known as Juniper Canyon Launch, along the John Day River in Wheeler County. The primary purpose and need of this project is to provide toilet facilities to meet the needs of recreation users, to protect visual and water quality, and improve public health and safety. This project is located within the John Day Wild and Scenic River corridor and within the John Day State Scenic Waterway. The EA is attached to and incorporated by reference in this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) determination. A no action alternative was analyzed in the EA. The proposed action would authorize the installation of a CXT vault toilet at Lower Burnt Ranch Recreation Site along the John Day River. The toilet installation would be in compliance with State Scenic Waterway statutes.

**Plan Conformance:**

The proposed project has been reviewed and found to be in conformance with one or more of the following BLM plans and associated Record of Decision(s): Two Rivers RMP, June 1986, and the John Day River Management Plan, February 2001.

**Finding of No Significant Impact Determination:**

Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the project is not a major federal action and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27 and do not exceed those effects described in the Two Rivers RMP/FEIS, June 1986, and the John Day River Management Plan/FEIS, February 2001. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed. This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as described:

**Context:** The project is a site-specific action directly involving approximately 1/8 acre of BLM administered land that by itself does not have international, national, regional, or state-wide importance.

**Intensity:** The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27 and the additional criteria as required by the following Instruction Memorandum, Acts and Executive Orders: Instruction Memorandum No. 99-178, the Lacey Act, as amended; the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974; the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; Executive Order 13112 on Invasive Species; Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice; Clean Water Act of 1987; Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments to the Clean Water Act of 1996; Executive Order 12088 on federal compliance with pollution control standards, as amended; Executive Order 12589 on Superfund compliance; and Executive Order dated July 14, 1982 on intergovernmental review of federal programs.

1. **Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse.** The proposed action would impact resources as described in the EA. Mitigations to reduce impacts were incorporated in the design of the action alternative. None of the environmental effects discussed in detail in the EA are considered significant, nor do the effects exceed those described in the Two Rivers RMP/FEIS, June 1986, and the John Day River Management Plan/FEIS, February 2001.
2. **The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.** The proposed action is designed to improve public health and safety especially for members of the public recreating in the immediate area.
3. **Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.** The potential impacts to wild and scenic rivers are discussed in the EA. There are no effects to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, or ecologically critical areas.
4. **The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** The proposed action is likely to be supported by recreation users. Although installation of a toilet may lead to increased use over time, most people prefer a toilet to the alternative of an uncontrolled human waste situation.
5. **The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.** The project is not unique or unusual. The BLM has experience implementing similar actions in similar areas. There are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.
6. **The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** The actions considered in the preferred alternative were considered by the interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted.
7. **Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.** The interdisciplinary team evaluated the possible actions in context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted.
8. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.** The project will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will it cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.
9. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered**

**Species Act of 1973.** There are no adverse affects to any threatened or endangered species.

- 10. Whether the action threatens a violation of a Federal, State, Local, or Tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment, where non-Federal requirements are consistent with Federal requirements.** The project does not violate any known Federal, State, Local or Tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. Furthermore, the project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.
- 11. Comply with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (water resource development projects only).** There are no floodplains, wetlands or water resource projects involved in this project.
- 12. Involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E)) not already decided in an approved land use plan.** There are no unresolved conflicts not already approved in land use plans.
- 13. Have a disproportionate significant adverse impacts on low income or minority populations; Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).** This project does not have a disproportionate significant adverse impacts on low income or minority populations; Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).
- 14. Restrict access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites; Executive Order 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites). Have significant adverse effect on Indian Trust Resources.** This project does not restrict access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites; Executive Order 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites). This project does not have significant adverse effects on Indian Trust Resources.
- 15. Contribute to the introduction, existence, or spread of: Federally listed noxious weeds (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act); or invasive non-native species; Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species).** This project does not contribute to the introduction, existence, or spread of: Federally listed noxious weeds or invasive non-native species.
- 16. Have a direct or indirect adverse impact on energy development, production, supply, and/or distribution; Executive Order 13212 (Actions to Expedite Energy-Related Projects).** This project does not have a direct or indirect adverse impact on energy development, production, supply, and/or distribution.

Approved By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Field Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date